



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,324	07/27/2001	Jong In Lee	101916-200	1229

27267 7590 08/15/2003

WIGGIN & DANA LLP
ATTENTION: PATENT DOCKETING
ONE CENTURY TOWER, P.O. BOX 1832
NEW HAVEN, CT 06508-1832

EXAMINER

FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,324

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Jamara A. Franklin

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figures 1-3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

in claim 1, line 9, substitute "it has been determined" with --a determination has been made--;

in claim 2, line 2, substitute "can be" with --is--;

in claim 4, line 2, substitute "can not be" with --is not--;

in claim 7, line 2, substitute "it has been determined" with --a determination is made--;

and

in claim 10, line 8, substitute "it has been determined" with --a determination is made--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2876

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watson (US 5,991,750) in view of Pescitelli et al. (US 5,845,256) (hereinafter referred to as 'Pescitelli').

Watson teaches a system and method from preauthorization of individual account transactions wherein an account user 604 requests goods or services of an account manager 602. The account manager negotiates a price quotation 622 from a merchant 606 or from other sources. Following a disclosure of an account number to a merchant, account manager 602 performs a pre-authorization request 626. The pre-authorization request 628 then flows from card issuer 614 to authorizing agent 612 for population of a pre-authorization table 318. Upon the rendering of services or the delivery of goods, merchant 606 issues an authorization request comprising the account number disclosed with the amount of the transaction. Authorizing agent 612 performs an authorization procedure and renders an authorization response 632 stating the status of either acceptance or denial of the requested transaction to merchant 606 (col. 9, line 7-col. 13, line 48).

Watson lacks the teaching of the transactions taking place at a self-service facility and the teaching of issuing a receipt for the executed transaction.

Pescitelli teaches a self-service vending system wherein a receipt is issued upon the approval of a transaction (col. 11, line 61-col. 12, line 6).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that modifying the invention of Watson with a self-service terminal would have been advantageous for making the system and act of conducting a transaction less time-consuming since much of the interaction

Art Unit: 2876

between merchant and customer may be eliminated. Additionally, the modification of the Watson reference to include the issuing of a receipt after a transaction has occurred would have also been advantageous for giving the consumer physical evidence of the transaction for future reference or personal record keeping. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Watson with the aforementioned teachings of Pescitelli.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rowney et al. (US 5,996,076) teach a system, method, and article of manufacture for secure digital certification of electronic commerce.

Bissonette et al. (US 6,343,279) teach a system integrating credit card transactions into a financial management system.

D'Agostino (US 6,324,526) teaches a system and method for performing secure credit card purchases.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is 703-305-0128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the


Application/Control Number: 09/917,324

Page 5

Art Unit: 2876

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Jamara A. Franklin
Examiner
Art Unit 2876

JAF
August 10, 2003



MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800